

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES.

APRIL 7, 1858.—Ordered to be printed.

Mr. EVANS submitted the following

REPORT.

*The Committee on Revolutionary Claims, to whom were referred the papers in support of the claim of Catharine Kellar to a pension, on account of the services of her husband, Conrad Kellar, having examined the same, beg leave to report :*

The petitioner is the widow of one Conrad Kellar, who, she alleges, was a soldier in the Pennsylvania line, in a regiment commanded by Colonel Broadhead. But, unfortunately, she is able to produce no evidence of the fact, except her own testimony. She says she lived in the same neighborhood, and was cognizant of the fact of her husband's enlistment, but knows nothing of his service, except the information which she received from him. Said Conrad lived until 1825, but never applied for a pension under the act of 1818. She was married to him in 1793. The prayer of the petition is, that she may be allowed a pension under the act of 7th of July, 1837. To entitle her to a pension under this act it is necessary to prove that her husband performed at least six months' service during the war of the revolution, and that her marriage took place before the year 1794. The main difficulty of the case arises from the defect of the proof of service. Under a recent act, the time of marriage is extended to 1800, and the evidence of her marriage before that time is pretty clearly established by her daughter. The only evidence of enlistment is, as before stated, that of the petitioner herself, who says her husband enlisted in 1777. At that time she was only eight years old, according to the account which she gives of her birth. Broadhead's regiment was a well known regiment in the Pennsylvania line; and if the husband of the petitioner was a soldier in it, there should be some record evidence existing in the revolutionary records in the public offices of Pennsylvania, or in the War Department. If such evidence exists, the petitioner will be entitled to a pension on establishing her claim at the Pension Office.

Your committee are of opinion that the evidence is too unsatisfactory to authorize any favorable action by Congress. They, therefore, recommend that the petition be refused.

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

April 7, 1854—Continued to be printed.

Mr. Kays submitted the following

REPORT

The Committee on Revolutionary Claims, to whom were referred the papers in support of the claim of Catherine Heller as a pension, on account of the services of her husband, Conrad Heller, during the war of 1812, have the honor to report:

The petitioner is the widow of one Conrad Heller, who, she alleges, was a soldier in the Pennsylvania line in a regiment commanded by Colonel Brownhead. But, unfortunately, she is able to produce no evidence of the fact, except her own testimony. She says she lived in the same neighborhood, and was cognizant of the fact of her husband's enlistment, but knows nothing of his service, except the information which she received from him. Said Conrad lived until 1835, but never applied for a pension under the act of 1818. She was married to him in 1793. The prayer of the petition is, that she may be allowed a pension under the act of July, 1837. To enable her to prove that her husband performed at least six months' service during the war of the revolution, and that her marriage took place before the year 1794—the main difficulty of the case arises from the defect of the proof of service. Under a recent act, the time of marriage is extended to 1800, and the evidence of her marriage before that time is pretty clearly established by her daughter. The only evidence of enlistment is, as before stated, that of the petitioner herself, who says her husband enlisted in 1777. At that time she was only eight years old, according to the account which she gives of her birth. Brownhead's regiment was a well known regiment in the Pennsylvania line; and if the husband of the petitioner was a soldier in it, there should be some record evidence existing in the revolutionary records in the public office of Pennsylvania, or in the War Department. If such evidence exists, the petitioner will be entitled to a pension on establishing her claim at the Pension Office.

Your committee are of opinion that the evidence is too unsatisfactory to authorize any favorable action by Congress. They, therefore, recommend that the petition be refused.